

The Tucker Act grants the United States Court of Federal Claims jurisdiction over monetary actions “against the United States founded either upon the Constitution, or any Act of Congress or any regulation of an executive department, or upon any express or implied contract with the United States, or for liquidated or unliquidated damages in cases not sounding in tort.”

28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1). It does not confer jurisdiction over claims against any entity other than the United States. United States v. Sherwood, 312 U.S. 584, 588 (1941). Further, the Court lacks jurisdiction over claims for injunctive relief unless such relief is “incident of and collateral to” a monetary judgment, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(2), which means it is “tied and subordinate to a money judgment,” James v. Caldera, 159 F.3d 573, 580 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (quoting Austin v. United States, 206 Ct. Cl. 719, 723 (1975)).

The present complaint involves claims against state and local government entities, not the United States. It also requests injunctive relief not collateral to a money judgment. The Court lacks jurisdiction over the complaint. A transfer of the complaint is warranted in the interests of justice. Therefore, the Court directs that the Clerk **TRANSFER** the case to the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1631.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Elaine D. Kaplan

ELAINE D. KAPLAN
Judge